

1 MARK R. THIERMAN, (State Bar No. 72913)
2 LEON GREENBERG, (State Bar No. 226253)
THIERMAN LAW FIRM
3 7287 Lakeside Drive, Suite 101
Reno, NV 89511
Telephone: (775) 284-1500
4 Facsimile: (775) 703-5027

E-Filed 3/10/2011

5 H. TIM HOFFMAN, (State Bar No. 49141)
ARTHUR W. LAZEAR, (State Bar No. 83603)
6 ROSS L. LIBENSON, (State Bar No. 181912)
HOFFMAN & LAZEAR
7 180 Grand Avenue, Suite 1550
Oakland, CA 94612
8 Telephone: (510) 763-5700
Facsimile: (510) 835-1311

9
10 MAX FOLKENFLIK
FOLKENFLIK & MCGERITY
1500 Broadway, 21St Floor
11 New York, NY 10036
Telephone: (212)757-0400
12 Facsimile: (212)757-2010

13 INTERIM LEAD COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFFS

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

16 SAN JOSE DIVISION

17 DAVID HO, on behalf of himself and others
similarly situated and on behalf of the
18 general public and DOES 1-20

Case No. CV 05-04867 JF (HRL)

19 Plaintiff,

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
ORDER EXTENDING THE PAGE LIMIT
FOR PLAINTIFFS' REPLY
MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION**

20 v.

21 ERNST & YOUNG, LLP

22 Defendant.

23 **Caption continued on next page.**

1 C 08-2853 JF (HRL)

2 JOSEPH LANDON individually and on
3 behalf of all others similarly situated,

4 Plaintiff,

5 v.

6 ERNST & YOUNG LLP, a limited liability
7 partnership; ERNST & YOUNG U.S. LLP, a
8 limited liability partnership; and DOES 1-
9 100, inclusive,

10 Defendant.

11 MICHELLE RICHARDS, on behalf 16 of
12 herself and all others similarly situated and
13 on behalf of the general public,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 ERNST & YOUNG LLP, and DOES - 50

17 Defendant.

18 C 08-4988 JF (HRL)

1 Plaintiffs Sarah Fernandez and Michelle Richards, and Defendant Ernst & Young LLP, by and
2 through their respective counsel, hereby agree and stipulate as follows:

3 **WHEREAS**, the parties' previously agreed, and the Court entered an Order, permitting the
4 parties to exceed the page limit for the Plaintiffs' Memorandum In Support of Class Certification and
5 Defendant's Memorandum In Opposition to Class Certification;

6 **WHEREAS**, Plaintiffs have requested a page extension of five (5) pages for its Reply
7 Memorandum, the parties have met and conferred and agreed that Plaintiffs may have twenty (20)
8 pages for their Reply Memorandum to Defendant's Opposition To Class Certification, the page limit
9 for Plaintiffs' Reply Memorandum should be amended as follows:

- 10 1. Plaintiffs' Reply Memorandum in support of their motion for class certification may be
11 twenty (20) pages in length.

12 Respectfully submitted,

13 Dated: March 8, 2011

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP

14 By _____ /s/
15 Gregory W. Knopp
16 Attorneys for Defendant,
17 ERNST & YOUNG LLP

18 Dated: March 8, 2011

HOFFMAN & LAZEAR

19 By _____ /s/
20 Ross L. Libenson
21 Attorneys for Plaintiffs David Ho, Sarah Fernandez and
22 Michelle Richards

23 ///

24 ///

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 Dated: March 10, 2010

By _____
The Honorable James L. Fugel
26 JUDGE, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

27
28 STIPULATION and [proposed] order EXTENDING THE PAGE LIMIT FOR plaintiffs' REPLY MEMORANDUM IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION

CV 05-04867 JF